Appeal Evidence

<u>Koennecke v. Hartvig, et al.</u>, BAP No. 97-1556-DMeJ <u>In re Koennecke</u>, Case No. 396-32060-dds7

5/13/98

BAP aff'q DDS

Unpublished

Debtor filed a chapter 7 petition while incarcerated serving a 20 year sentence for first degree manslaughter and assault. Anticipating the imminent entry of nondischargeability judgments in favor of his victims under 11 U.S.C. § 523(a)(6), debtor moved to convert his case to chapter 13. The bankruptcy court denied the motion to convert, finding that the motion was in bad faith and that the debtor had unfairly manipulated the bankruptcy In support of its oral findings, the bankruptcy court incorporated earlier findings in an adversary proceeding wherein the trustee had recovered fraudulent transfers made to debtor's domestic partner in contemplation of bankruptcy. Debtor appealed the bankruptcy court's denial of the motion on the basis that the record before the bankruptcy court contained insufficient evidence to support a finding of bad faith . The BAP affirmed, concluding it had not rational basis to conclude that the bankruptcy court's findings were not based on the evidence where the Debtor failed to provide the entire record to the Panel.

BK CT

NOT FOR PUBLICATION DISTRICT OF OREGON

UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY APPELLATE PANEL

MAY 1 3 1998

OF THE NINTH CIRCUIT

In re

) BAP No. OR-97-1556 DMCJ

)

DUANE L. KOENNECKE,

) Bk No. 396-32060-dds7

)

Debtor.

)

DUANE L. KOENNECKE,

Appellant,

v.

DONALD H. HARTVIG, Ch. 7 Trustee; DIANA PACE; WENDY ADAMS,

Appellees.

FILED

LODGED

MEMORANDUM1

MAY 13 1998 20

NANCY B. DICKERSON, CLERK U.S. BKCY. APP. PANEL OF THE NINTH CIRCUIT

Argued and Submitted on March 19, 1998 at Portland, Oregon

Filed - May 13, 1998

Appeal from the United States Bankruptcy Court for the District of Oregon

Honorable Donal D. Sullivan, Bankruptcy Judge, Presiding

Before: DONOVAN2, MEYERS, and JONES, Bankruptcy Judges.

This disposition is not appropriate for publication and may not be cited to or by the courts of this circuit except when relevant under the doctrines of the law of the case, res judicata, or collateral estoppel. See BAP Rule 13 & Ninth Circuit Rule 36.3.

Hon. Thomas B. Donovan, Bankruptcy Judge for the Central District of California, sitting by designation.

I. BACKGROUND

Duane Koennecke (Debtor) filed a chapter 7 petition on March 26, 1996. At the time, the Debtor was incarcerated serving a 20 year sentence for first degree manslaughter for killing Robert Rodman (Rodman) and assault for shooting Wendy Adams (Adams). Prior to the Debtor's bankruptcy, Adams and Rodman's estate, through its representative Diana Pace (Pace), had been awarded state court judgments against the Debtor totaling \$2.5 million in compensatory and punitive damages. These damage awards constituted the bulk of the Debtor's liabilities. Adams and Pace later prevailed in timely bankruptcy court \$523(a)(6)3 nondischargeability suits against the Debtor.

Lori Rains (Rains) is the Debtor's common law wife and the mother of his child. One week prior to filing his bankruptcy petition, the Debtor conveyed his interest in his home to Rains as part of a child support agreement. Rains resided in the house after the Debtor's incarceration and during the course of the bankruptcy. Prior to filing his petition, the Debtor also transferred his interest in timber property to his father for \$15,000, though the Debtor stated in his schedules that he had received \$43,000 for this transfer.

The chapter 7 trustee (Trustee) sued and obtained

Unless otherwise indicated, all chapter and section references are to the Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S.C. §§101-1330.

judgments from the trial court avoiding the pre-petition transfers made by the Debtor to Rains and the Debtor's father. The Trustee initiated procedures to evict Rains from the home to facilitate the trustee's sale of the home. The Trustee received a \$120,000 offer for the timber property, nearly three times the value asserted by the Debtor in his statement of affairs.

When the Trustee prepared to evict Rains from the home, the Debtor moved to convert his bankruptcy case to chapter 13, claiming that doing so would allow him to discharge more debt than he could under chapter 7. The Debtor has a monthly income of \$130, \$50 of which he earns in his prison job and \$80 of which is a gift from an undisclosed source. The bankruptcy court denied the Debtor's motion to convert based on the court's finding that the Debtor had acted in bad faith in seeking to convert his chapter 7 case to chapter 13. The Debtor filed a timely appeal from that decision.

II. ISSUE

Did the bankruptcy court err when it found that the Debtor's motion to convert had been filed in bad faith?

The Debtor urges that he wanted to convert his chapter 7 case to chapter 13 in order to receive a discharge of debts that would not be discharged under chapter 7 and that evidence of such desire is not sufficient to support a finding of bad faith. This Panel agrees that the mere fact that a debtor would like the benefit of a more extensive discharge does not warrant a finding of bad faith on a motion to convert. The bankruptcy court, however, did not base its finding of bad faith solely on the fact that the

III. STANDARD OF REVIEW

A bankruptcy court's finding of fact must be upheld unless clearly erroneous. <u>In re Eisen</u>, 14 F.3d 469, 470 (9th Cir. 1994). "A finding is 'clearly erroneous' when although there is evidence to support it, the reviewing court on the entire evidence is left with the definite and firm conviction that a mistake has been committed." <u>United States v. United States Gypsum Co.</u>, 333 U.S. 364, 395 (1948).

IV. DISCUSSION

The Debtor argues that the record before the bankruptcy court contained insufficient evidence to support a finding of bad faith; therefore, the Debtor's motion to convert to chapter 13 should have been granted.

The bankruptcy court's finding of bad faith here was based on a variety of factors derived from the evidence before the bankruptcy court. The reviewing court must determine "whether the court below made sufficient factual findings" to make a ruling based on bad faith. In re Goeb, 675 F.2d 1386, 1389 (9th Cir. 1982). See In re Eisen, 14 F.3d 469.

In considering the circumstances of this case, the

Debtor was seeking in chapter 13 a more extensive discharge than he could receive in chapter 7. Instead, it found that based on the totality of the circumstances, the Debtor was acting in bad faith. (TR 103:4-14, 105:7-107:17). The issue is not whether the judge was incorrect in finding that the desire to discharge debt was bad faith per se, but rather whether the bankruptcy court had sufficient evidence to find that the Debtor's motion to convert was made in bad faith under all the evidence considered by the bankruptcy court.

bankruptcy court made the following preliminary findings:

In October of 1996 the Debtor was convicted of First Degree Manslaughter, Second Degree Assault and being a Felon in Possession of a Firearm, all the consequences of a shooting which took place in September of 1995. After the shooting, the Debtor transferred substantially all of his real property assets to insider third parties and thereafter filed a voluntary chapter 7 proceeding. The trustee successfully challenged these transfers and recovered the property for the benefit of the Debtor's creditors. (TR 103:4-14)

The Debtor transferred his home to Rains with actual intent to hinder, delay or defraud the victims of his criminal actions. (TR 105:21-24)

The Debtor made misleading statements in his statement of affairs and misled the Trustee concerning timber property that the Debtor transferred to his father for significantly less than market value. (TR 106:7-22)

The Debtor's motion to convert was timed so that it would interfere with the Trustee's attempts to evict Rains from the home. (TR 106:23-25)

The Debtor did not have the ability to fund a plan which suggested manipulation and an attempt by the Debtor to use the Bankruptcy Code in an inequitable manner. (TR 107:1-5)

The Debtor's purpose for converting to chapter 13 was to manipulate the bankruptcy process in order to gain an opportunity to share in a substantial inheritance from his father. (TR 107:6-17)

The Debtor claims that these findings were not supported by the record and, therefore, that the bankruptcy court's conclusion that the Debtor was acting in bad faith was clearly erroneous. The transcript as provided by the Debtor reflects the trial court's careful explanation of its factual basis for finding that the Debtor was acting in bad faith when he moved to convert his case to chapter 13. (TR 103:4-14, 105:7-

107:17). What the transcript shows, as furnished to this Panel by the Debtor, is that in arriving at its decision, the bankruptcy court incorporated its previous findings in the fraudulent transfer suits previously litigated by the Debtor's chapter 7 trustee. In arriving at its bad faith finding, the bankruptcy judge said, "I listened very carefully to the testimony. . . . I have studied the exhibits which have been admitted," though this Panel has not been furnished with a transcript of that testimony or copies of all exhibits that were admitted by the bankruptcy court.

This Panel must assume that the bankruptcy court's findings of fact are correct because there is nothing in the record before this Panel that establishes that the bankruptcy court could not reasonably have arrived at its findings in light of the testimony and exhibits in the chapter 7 trustee's fraudulent transfer suits. The Debtor, as the appellant, bears the burden of providing this Panel with evidence demonstrating clear error by the bankruptcy court. "The appellant has the burden of showing a trial court's findings of fact are clearly erroneous. The responsibility to file an adequate record also rests with the Appellants." In re

Burkhart, 84 B.R. 658, 660 (9th Cir. BAP 1988) (citations omitted).

The Debtor provided the Panel with excerpts of the record that do not contain evidentiary support for the bankruptcy court's findings. However, the record provided by appellant

to the Panel is clearly incomplete. The bankruptcy court referred to documents not included in the record as provided to the Panel. Since the Debtor has failed to provide the entire record, this Panel has no rational basis to conclude that the bankruptcy court's findings were not based on the evidence. Put another way, the bankruptcy court's findings address in a logical and orderly way the factors that the bankruptcy court should have considered in determining the Debtor's lack of good faith. The record furnished by the Debtor does not establish an evidentiary basis for this Panel to conclude that the bankruptcy court acted without a proper evidentiary record. Rather, the factors enumerated in the bankruptcy court's findings adequately support a finding of the Debtor's bad faith.

V. CONCLUSION

The Debtor had the burden of proving to this Panel that the trial court's ruling was clearly erroneous but presented to this Panel no convincing evidence that the bankruptcy court made any error. The judgment is AFFIRMED.